

Interview Summary	Application No. 10/788,722	Applicant(s) ATKINSON ET AL.	
	Examiner Steven B. Pollicoff	Art Unit 3728	

All participants (applicant, applicant's representative, PTO personnel):

- (1) Steven B. Pollicoff. (3) Carrie Boone.
 (2) Jila Mohandesj. (4) _____

Date of Interview: 13 June 2006.

Type: a) ☒ Telephonic b) ☐ Video Conference
 c) ☐ Personal [copy given to: 1) ☐ applicant 2) ☐ applicant's representative]

Exhibit shown or demonstration conducted: d) ☐ Yes e) ☒ No.
 If Yes, brief description: _____

Claim(s) discussed: 1.


Identification of prior art discussed: Thomas (US Pat 4,893,713), Hulet (US Pat 5,033,621).

Agreement with respect to the claims f) ☐ was reached. g) ☒ was not reached. h) ☐ N/A.

Substance of Interview including description of the general nature of what was agreed to if an agreement was reached, or any other comments: See Continuation Sheet.

(A fuller description, if necessary, and a copy of the amendments which the examiner agreed would render the claims allowable, if available, must be attached. Also, where no copy of the amendments that would render the claims allowable is available, a summary thereof must be attached.)

THE FORMAL WRITTEN REPLY TO THE LAST OFFICE ACTION MUST INCLUDE THE SUBSTANCE OF THE INTERVIEW. (See MPEP Section 713.04). If a reply to the last Office action has already been filed, APPLICANT IS GIVEN A NON-EXTENDABLE PERIOD OF THE LONGER OF ONE MONTH OR THIRTY DAYS FROM THIS INTERVIEW DATE, OR THE MAILING DATE OF THIS INTERVIEW SUMMARY FORM, WHICHEVER IS LATER, TO FILE A STATEMENT OF THE SUBSTANCE OF THE INTERVIEW. See Summary of Record of Interview requirements on reverse side or on attached sheet.


JILA M. MOHANDESI
PRIMARY EXAMINER

Examiner Note: You must sign this form unless it is an Attachment to a signed Office action.

 Examiner's signature, if required

Continuation of Substance of Interview including description of the general nature of what was agreed to if an agreement was reached, or any other comments: Examiner and Applicant discussed whether claim 1 was sufficiently amended to have the case allowed and if not, what if any further changes to the claim may make it allowable. Examiner informed Applicant that based on the submitted amended claims, an updated search was necessary before making a determination of allowability and that if amended claim 1 were found to be allowable Applicant would be notified. If however the new search found new prior art that read on the invention, Examiner would send out a final rejection and Applicant could then proceed with after final practice .